

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are pending in the subject application upon entry of this Amendment. Claims 15-16 have been previously canceled without prejudice to the filing of a divisional application based on this subject matter.

Claims 1 and 12 have been clarified to further specify the deposition technique, as supported by pages 10-11 of the specification. New claim 17 has also been added, as supported by, e.g., the Examples.

In the outstanding Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-8, 10 and 12 under § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over US Patent 5,250,360 (Andrus et al.). The Examiner also rejects claims 9, 11, 13-14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Andrus et al. Lastly, the Examiner rejects claims 1-14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US2004/0115477 (Nesbitt) in view of US Patent 6,531,524 (Ring et al.).

The above rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

Andrus et al. relate to a specific composition comprising a barium silicate or strontium silicate glass-ceramic material. Andrus et al. further disclose at column 6 that electrostatic spraying is employed as the deposition method, wherein electrostatically charged dry glass powder is uniformly sprayed onto a superalloy body.

Andrus et al. do not disclose or suggest Applicants' claims wherein a fluidized bed or an electrostatic brush technique is employed. Andrus et al. relate to a completely different coating process, and the skilled artisan would not be motivated to look to Andrus et al. for guidance. Andrus et al. merely disclose that electrostatic spray deposition or mixing powdered glass with water or an organic vehicle, which is then applied over a glass surface, may be employed (Col. 6). Accordingly, the rejections based upon Andrus et al. should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Nesbitt discloses the application of dry particles to a layer of wet bonding material applied to a substrate. The wet bonding material includes an additive or agent, such as a resin. (Paragraph [0023]). The layers are then cured. (Paragraph [0035]). Thus, Nesbitt requires the interaction of a wet bonding layer and the dry particle layer to achieve its cured layered system. As disclosed at Page 3, paragraph [0020], Nesbitt is particularly directed to a coating reinforcing underlayment for coating substrates. This underlayment includes the wet bonding material described above. Nesbitt further discloses at Page 20, paragraph [0178], that the underlayment can be used as a single process without any topcoats to provide adhesion of paper or grip or tractive strength as related to moving paper or other products with a roller at high speeds.

At Paragraph [0147], Nesbitt discloses the use of tribocharged powder technology to enhance the dry particle attachment or adherence to the wet bonding material layer, particularly in odd-shaped configurations. Nesbitt requires the use of its wet bonding material layer to which its dry particles adhere. As in the case of Andrus et al., Nesbitt fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' deposition technique of a fluidized bed process or electrostatic brush deposition.

The addition of the Ring et al. reference does not cure the shortcomings of Nesbitt. That is, Ring et al. merely disclose various powder coating compositions relating to the reduction of gloss. Ring et al. appear to be particularly related to paint compositions (see Background and Summary). Ring et al. do not disclose or suggest the use of any powder coating compositions to protect gas turbine engine components, as claimed herein. Ring et al. also do not disclose or suggest Applicants' deposition technique employing a fluidized bed or electrostatic brush deposition, as claimed herein. In contrast, Ring et al. disclose that powder coatings are generally applied by an electrostatic spray process (see Field section).

It is asserted that there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art seeking to develop that which Applicants claim to combine and then modify the teachings of the afore-cited references in an attempt to arrive at the subject claims. Without such a teaching, suggestion or motivation, the modification may only be considered

obvious in hindsight, which is an improper basis for rejection.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, the Examiner is kindly requested to reconsider and remove the outstanding rejections of claims 1-14.

All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, the subject application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, such favorable action is requested.

A call to the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below would be appreciated should the Examiner have any questions.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine Wilkes Beninati 12/18/06  
Christine Wilkes Beninati Date  
Reg. No.: 37, 967

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
Customer No.: 29683  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
Telephone: (203)925-9400 (Ext. 17)  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245  
email: [cbeninati@hspatent.com](mailto:cbeninati@hspatent.com)

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

December 18, 2006  
Date

[Signature]  
Person Making Deposit